UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/306,888	05/07/1999	DAVID G OPSTAD	P2380-505	4127

21839 7590 10/02/2003		EXAMINER
BURNS DOANE SWECKER & MATHIS L L P		HAVAN, THU THAO

BURNS DOANE SWECKER & MATHIS L L P
POST OFFICE BOX 1404
ALEXANDRIA, VA   22313-1404

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2672	

DATE MAILED: 10/02/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

		Application No.		Applicant(s)	
Office Action Summary		09/306,888		OPSTAD ET AL.	
		Examiner		**Art Unit**	
		Thu-Thao Havan		2672	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _26 June 2003_ .

2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL.**   2b) ☒ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) _1-31_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) _1-9,11-13,16-20,22-27 and 29-31_ is/are rejected.

7) ☒ Claim(s) _10,14,15,21 and 28_ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

    If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

        1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

        2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

        3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

    a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .	6) ☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-31 have been considered but are

moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Objections

2.   Claims **10, 14-15, 21, and 28** are objected to as being dependent upon a

rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all

of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The prior art of record fails to anticipate or rendered obvious the technical

features of claims **10, 14-15, 21, and 28**. The prior art fails to teach or suggest having

determining whether data table is of a first type or a second type when the data is

determined not to be present in the font; directly initiating synthesizing step if data table

is of first type; or, providing an indication that data table is not present in the font if data

table is of second type, and initiating synthesizing step upon receipt of a request that is

responsive to indication as recited in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4.   Claims **1-9, 11-13, 16-20, 22-27, and 29-31** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

as being unpatentable over Sonnenschein (US patent no. 5,500,931) in view of Patel et

al (US patent no. 6,426,751).

Re claims **11, 19, and 26**, Sonnenschein teaches a system for generating

images of characters, comprising a font subsystem which is responsive to identification

of characters to access at least one font file to retrieve glyphs associated with the

identified characters (col. 5, lines 12-27), and data tables that contain information about

glyphs in the font (figs. 4-6), a font table synthesizer which is responsive to the absence

of a predetermined data table for creating and storing table on the basis of data

contained in the font file (col. 4, lines 41-52). In other words, Sonnenschein teaches a

data table pertains to the layout of the glyphs in figures 4-8f. Figures 4-6 and 8a-8f

disclose a predetermined data table for the needed glyphs. He discloses creating an

ordered font table containing a plurality of glyphs, each glyph corresponding to one

character in the ordered font table displayed in the first font style. His system

determines if the examined character can be displayed in the first font style by

searching the ordered font table to determine if there is an associated glyph for the

examined character, and if an associated glyph is found, then associating the first font

style with the examined character and associates the font style originally associated

with the examined character if the examined character does not have an associated

glyph in the ordered font table font.

Sonnenschein fails to specifically disclose creating a table. Nevertheless, both

Sonnenschein and Patel teach changes font style features. The glyphs are layout in

tables.

However, Patel specifically teaches creating a table (col. 1, lines 17-41; fig. 4). In

other words, Patel teaches creating a table for the font layout. The table contains

information on glyph positioning, glyph substitution, justification, and baseline

positioning. Patel's system creates subtables to store in fonts. Based on the font style

that are needed then the subtables are created. His system writes out the table or

subtable definitions into a font file by creating tables and other output. His system

process can use an optional glyph alias database. In one implementation, a feature file

is compiled and the rules extracted from the feature file are fed into table creation

modules. In this implementation, the interface to the table creation modules is extremely

simple as a result of the GNode representation--the creation process being defined by

the target and the replacement GNodes.

Therefore, taking the combined teaching of Sonnenschein and Patel as a whole,

it would have been obvious to combine the teaching of Patel to the system of

Sonnenschein because doing so would have enabled processing fonts to improve font

layout in a table format as noted in Patel (col. 1, lines 17-41; figs. 2 and 4-element 420).

Re claims **12 and 25**, Patel discloses font subsystem determines whether a

predetermined data table is contained in the font file, and causes synthesizer to create

table when a determination is made that the table is not present in the font file (col. 4,

line 52 to col. 5, line 7; fig. 4).

Re claims **13, 20, and 27**, Patel discloses an annex file (col. 7 to col. 14).

Re claims **6, 16, 22, and 29**, Sonnenschein teaches a method for automatically

synthesizing a data table that contains information about glyphs in a font, comprising

the steps of building a font map that contains information about individual glyphs in the

font (col. 5, lines 12-27), determining relationships between items of information in the

font map.

Sonnenschein fails to specifically disclose constructing a table.

However, Patel specifically teaches constructing a table (col. 1, lines 17-41; fig.

4). In other words, Patel teaches constructing a table for the font layout. The table

contains information on glyph positioning, glyph substitution, justification, and baseline

positioning.

Therefore, taking the combined teaching of Sonnenschein and Patel as a whole,

it would have been obvious to combine the teaching of Patel to the system of

Sonnenschein because doing so would have enabled processing fonts to improve font

layout in a table format as noted in Patel (col. 1, lines 17-41; figs. 2 and 4-element 420).

Re claims **7-8, 17-18, 23-24, and 30-31**, Sonnenschein discloses font map is

specific to the font and other information is generic to multiple fonts (col. 5, lines 39-59).

Re claims **1-5 and 9**, the limitations of claims 1-5 and 9 are analyzed as discussed with
respect to claims 11-13, 16-20, and 22-27 above.

Inquiries

5.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Thu-Thao Havan whose telephone number is (703) 308-

7062. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Thursday from 9:00-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Michael Razavi can be reached on (703) 305-4713.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 872-9314 (for Technology Center 2600 only)

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal

Drive, Arlington, VA, Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or

proceeding should be directed to the Technology Center 2600 Customer Service Office

whose telephone number is (703) 306-0377.

Thu-Thao Havan
September 8, 2003

MICHAEL RAZAVI
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600